

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-14 were pending. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 11-13 were rejected; Claim 14 has been allowed; and, Claims 8 and 9 objected to in the present Office action. Claims 1, 9 and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to Claim 9 on the basis of informalities. The Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for pointing out the minor informality in the claim, and has chosen an alternative approach to clarifying the subject matter. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment obviates the objection.

Claims 8 and 9 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that the claims contained allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for this action; however the Examiner's suggestion has not been adopted as, in view of the amendment to Claim 1, the objected to claims are now dependent on an allowable claim.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Khutoryansky et al. (US 5,636,259; "Khutoryansky").

The Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the clarity of the explanation of the claim construction which should be used. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended so as to recite the envelope rotation being over an angle of greater than 180 degrees. This angle is greater than the plus or minus 180 degree rotation shown as the difference in position of the X-ray head in Figs 10 and 11 of the reference.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a portion of an envelope of the x-ray source remains below the lower edge of the support arm and the lower edge of the mounting device when the envelope is rotated over an angle greater than 180 degrees about the horizontal axis of rotation.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment distinguishes the claim over the reference, and the claim should now be allowable, as well as those claims dependent thereon, and dependent on Claim 11, which has been similarly amended.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khutoryansky as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Horbascheck (US 2002/0118793; "Horbascheck"). Claim 6 is dependent on now allowable Claim 1, and is allowable, without more.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 and 11-14 are pending.

For at least the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable and looks forward to the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Sid Bennett
Registration No. 53,981
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200